DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 244 JC 690 285

By-Gifford, Brian M.
Opinions of Men's Social Fraternities.
Pub Date [69]
Note-13p.; NDEA Institute paper
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75
Descriptors-*Administrator Attitudes, *Fraternities, *Junior Colleges, Social Attitudes, *Student Attitudes, *Student Organizations
Identifiers-Missouri

Since all institutions are being challenged for relevancy to the modern world, it seemed appropriate to see how fraternities are regarded: in what areas are they held in high esteem? how are they misunderstood? how can they best attract future members? To determine attitudes to the fraternity system, a questionnaire was specially prepared and sent to fraternity and sorority members, men and women in residence halls, and faculty and administration members. Questions were asked about living costs and conditions, academic value, social status, importance to the campus, whether they should be abolished, the use of alcohol, control of student offices, pledging, and morals. The results uncovered areas that should be evaluated by the Interfraternity Council, especially living costs, academic value, and pledge hazing. Fraternity activities in general should be examined to be sure they are in accord with the aims and purposes of the college. This should be done by each house individually, and the opinions and decisions exchanged with fraternities on other campuses. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED031244

OPINIONS OF MEN'S SOCIAL FRATERNITIES

Brian M. Gifford

University of Missouri-Columbia

At a time when society and all its institutions, including the University, are being challenged as to their relevancy, all organizations must make self-examinations and work for appropriate change and improvement. One such organization in need of self examination is the college fraternity system on individual campuses according to Jack Matthews (1968), Dean of Students at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

While many articles have been written in journals, magazines, and newspapers expressing opinions about fraternities, most authors fail to mention whether their enthusiasm for or attitudes against fraternities are shared by others. Also, most articles are based on opinions fostered on individual campuses and should not be generalized to other campuses.

Problem

It seems important that if fraternities on the University of Missouri-Columbia campus are to take a hard look at themselves, local data expressing what others think of them must be available. This data should be available to fraternities for several reasons. They may wish to discover those areas in which the public hold them in high regard; they may want to avoid unfavorable legislation that is prompted by negative attitudes formed through misunderstandings; or they may wish

JC 690 285

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 23 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

to determine what negative characteristics may be attributed to them by those whom they may wish to attract as future members.

Since no local data was available, this study was designed to identify opinions held by fraternity members, sorority members, faculty and administrators, men's residence hall members, and women's residence hall members. With data then available, the fraternity system may want to make changes where necessary and attempt to remedy possible misunderstandings which lead to unfavorable opinions.

Method

Since no appropriate instrument was available to measure the opinions that existed toward the men's social fraternities at UMC, a Likert (1932) type rating scale was designed. Articles, both pro- and anti-fraternity that appeared in books, magazines and journals were helpful in formulating the statements to be used on the opinionnaire. The Interfraternity Council President and the Interfraternity Council Advisor also made significant contributions to the statements to be rated. The criteria used for selecting the statements were taken from Edwards (1957). A panel of experts including the Interfraternity Advisor, Student Activities Director, presently active in fraternity affairs on the national level, and the President of the Interfraternity Council critiqued the opinionnaire to provide additional validity. The final statements included both those of positive and negative opinion toward fraternities and were placed in order randomly to eliminate any possible systematic variance.

A stratified random sampling technique was used to select the

fraternity members, sorority members, men's residence hall members, and women's residence hall members. A simple random sampling technique was used for selecting the faculty-administrator sample. Respondents to the opinionnaire were asked to choose a response to each statement: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between the opinions of fraternity members and other responding groups sampled.

Results

The results of the opinionnaires were tallied for frequency distribution with the percentages of each respondent group reported in Table 1.

Chi square analysis was also used comparing the fraternity opinions with each of the other respondent groups. However, due to low frequency in some cells, the raw data was collapsed to three categories, Agree, Undecided, and Disagree, for the purpose of chi square analysis. Chi square results are reported in Table 2.

On items pertaining to room and board accommodations, fraternities and sororities felt that living conditions were better in fraternity houses than in residence halls. Significant differences existed between the fraternity view on this statement and that of the faculty-administrator and men's and women's residence hall groups. The latter three feeling that living conditions were no better in fraternity houses. This supported Havice's (1966) argument that with attractive residence halls, students no longer feel the need for fraternity living because of better housing accomodations.

Significant differences existed between the fraternity members and men's and women's residence hall members on opinions of fraternity house costs versus apartment living costs. All groups sampled agreed that costs were greater for fraternity members living in fraternity houses than for non-members living in apartments. However, men's and women's residence hall groups agreed more strongly with this statement.

Only the faculty-administrator sample differed significantly from the fraternities opinions on the statement that fraternity house costs are greater than residence hall costs. All groups again agreed that costs were greater for fraternity living than for residence hall living but the faculty-administrator sample was not in as strong agreement as the other four groups.

On statements designed to sample opinions as to the academic value of fraternities, significant differences existed between the fraternity members opinions, men's and women's residence hall, and the faculty-administrator groups. The latter three disagreed with the following statements: "Study conditions in fraternities are better than in residence halls," "Fraternities make a significant contribution to the intellectual level on campus," and "Belonging to a fraternity is a benefit academically." Fraternity and sorority members agreed with the above statements.

Insert Table 1 about here

All groups sampled felt that membership in a fraternity increases

one's social status. However, significant differences did exist between the fraternity opinion and that of men's and women's residence hall members with the latter two agreeing to a lesser extent than that of the fraternities.

Of groups sampled, all were not as complimentary in responding to the statement that more social skills are learned being a fraternity member than are learned being a residence hall member. The fraternity, sorority, and faculty-administrator respondents were in agreement with the statement but the men's and women's residence hall members were in slight disagreement with the statement. Significant differences existed between the fraternity opinions and that of the faculty-administrator, and men's and women's residence hall groups sampled.

In responding to the statement that the fraternities at UMC should not be recognized as student organizations on campus, all groups disagree. The only group differing significantly from the fraternity opinion was that of the sororities. They were in stronger disagreement with the statement than were fraternity members.

All groups sampled agreed that fraternities are declining in importance on the campus with the exception of the fraternities,who tended to disagree. The only groups to differ significantly with the opinion of the fraternities however were the faculty-administrator and men's residence hall groups. The same response was made to the statement that fraternities will decline in importance in the future with the only significant difference of opinion being that of the faculty-administrators. The faculty-administrator respondents felt more strongly

than others that fraternities will decline in importance.

When asked if the University of Missouri should get rid of all fraternities, all respondent groups disagreed with the statement. Significant differences existed between the fraternity respondents and those of the faculty-administrator and men's residence hall respondents with the latter two groups being in less disagreement with the statement.

Two statements sampled opinions concerning fraternities and the use of alcoholic beverages. Fraternities, sororities, and women's residence hall members disagreed with the statement that more alcoholic beverages are consumed by fraternity members than nonmenbers. The faculty-administrator group and men's residence hall groups tended to agree. A significant difference existed between the fraternity and the sorority and women's residence hall groups.

When asked to respond to the statement that consumption of alcoholic beverages should be allowed in fraternity houses, fraternity members were in agreement with the statement while sorority, faculty-administrators, and women's residence hall members were approximately split on those agreeing and disagreeing. Only the men's residence hall sample responded with disagreement to the statement. Significant differences from the fraternity opinion existed with all groups.

In responding to the statement that fraternities control most of the student offices on campus, the trend of the responses was in agreement with the statement with the exception of the women's residence hall sample who tended to disagree. Significant differences existed only between the fraternity sample and the faculty-administrator group.

When asked if fraternity pledge hazing or harrassment has decreased in recent years, all groups with the exception of the men's residence hall group agreed. The nearly unanimous agreement of the fraternity members however caused significant differences of opinion to exist between the fraternity and faculty-administrator, and men's and women's residence hall groups.

Concerning fraternity morals, fraternities and sororities tended to agree that fraternities promote conduct consistent with good morals while the faculty-administrator, and men's and women's residence hall groups were in general disagreement with the statement. Fraternity opinion differed significantly from the latter three groups mentioned. The same response was illicited from the groups on the statement that the activities of fraternities are in accord with the aims and purposes of the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Insert Table 2 about here

Discussion

This study indicates that many differences of opinion exist about fraternities on the UMC campus. With the above results now available, it is hoped that the Interfraternity Council will carefully evaluate the data. Areas to which data indicated immediate attention should be given are those of cost of fraternity living, academic value of fraternities, and pledge hazing since these will directly influence pledging next year. Also, a careful evaluation of fraternity activities should be

made since non-Greek respondents felt that such activities were not in accord with the aims and purposes of UMC.

Individual house discussions about the results should be encouraged. If change is to take place within the fraternity system, it must be on a house by house basis. If individuals from the other sampled campus groups were invited for these discussions, excellent opportunities for better understanding of the fraternity system would be open to all.

Fraternities and sororities were quite closely allied on opinions about fraternities with significant differences existing on five of twenty statements. It is interesting to note the apparent dichotomy that was formed when comparing fraternity opinion with that of the faculty-administrator, and men's and women's residence hall groups. Here, significant differences were shown on fifteen, fifteen, and fourteen of the twenty statements respectively. It appears that Greeks on the UMC campus are unrealistic in their opinions of the fraternity system or fail in communicating the true nature of fraternities to non-Greeks on campus or both.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE TABLES SHOWING RESPONDENTS DISTRIBUTION PER ITEM.

Statement	Group	Response Strongly Agree	Agree	Unde-cided	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
1. Fraternities control most of the student offices on campus.	Frat.	2	52	15	28	2
	Sor.	3	64	8	26	0
	Fac-Adm	5	30	36	30	0
	Men RH	3	48	27	21	0
	Women RH	2	36	11	49	2
2. More alcoholic beverages are consumed by fraternity members than non-members.	Frat	15	17	26	30	11
	Sor	0	10	13	51	26
	Fac-Adm	14	32	20	34	0
	Men RH	12	33	15	33	6
	Women RH	9	27	7	38	20
3. Pledge hazing or harrassment has decreased in fraternities in recent years	Frat	43	50	0	4	2
	Sor	23	64	8	5	0
	Fac-Adm	2	66	20	9	2
	Men RH	0	33	33	24	9
	Women RH	9	44	24	20	2
4. Fraternity members have more fun than nonmembers.	Frat	28	48	13	7	2
	Sor	18	26	31	21	5
	Fac-Adm	0	23	23	47	7
	Men RH	6	9	12	42	30
	Women RH	0	9	16	42	33
5. I would like to see the University of Missouri get rid of all fraternities.	Frat	0	0	2	17	80
	Sor	0	0	5	18	64
	Fac-Adm	14	7	27	39	11
	Men RH	6	9	21	42	21
	Women RH	4	0	20	38	38
6. Room and board accomodations are better in fraternities than in residence hall.	Frat	39	35	20	7	0
	Sor	33	33	21	13	0
	Fac-Adm	2	16	20	30	7
	Men RH	6	27	30	24	12
	Women RH	4	36	18	31	11
7. Fraternities make a signigicant contribution to the intellectual level on campus.	Frat	13	46	17	22	2
	Sor	23	51	21	5	0
	Fac-Adm	2	16	16	47	18
	Men RH	6	15	24	36	18
	Women RH	2	18	33	40	7
8. College costs are greater for fraternity members living in fraternity houses than for nonmembers living in apartments.	Frat	11	37	13	35	4
	Sor	5	41	18	33	3
	Fac-Adm	14	41	30	18	0
	Men RH	27	36	30	3	3
	Women RH	13	47	13	11	4

TABLE 1
CONTINUED

Statement	Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unde-cided	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
9. Membership in a fraternity increases one's social status on campus.	Frat	17	67	9	7	0
	Sor	13	64	10	13	0
	Fac-Adm	11	52	25	11	2
	Men RH	15	45	6	30	3
	Women RH	9	49	16	20	7
10. Fraternities will decline in importance in the future.	Frat	7	28	17	37	11
	Sor	3	46	21	28	3
	Fac-Adm	16	43	34	7	0
	Men RH	6	45	24	24	0
	Women RH	9	47	18	27	0
11. More social skills are learned being a fraternity member than are learned being a residence hall member.	Frat	52	41	2	2	2
	Sor	15	72	10	3	0
	Fac-Adm	7	55	11	20	7
	Men RH	0	39	18	30	12
	Women RH	5	43	2	36	16
12. College costs are greater for fraternity members living in fraternity housing than for nonmembers living in residence halls.	Frat	19	50	15	13	2
	Sor	10	49	13	26	3
	Fac-Adm	9	52	34	2	2
	Men RH	30	48	15	6	0
	Women RH	18	60	18	4	0
13. Fraternities should not be recognized as student organizations at the University of Missouri.	Frat	2	4	17	26	50
	Sor	0	0	5	26	64
	Fac-Adm	2	14	16	57	11
	Men RH	3	12	6	70	9
	Women RH	4	13	11	56	16
14. Study conditions in fraternities are better than in residence halls.	Frat	22	43	22	11	2
	Sor	31	38	21	10	0
	Fac-Adm	0	5	52	39	5
	Men RH	9	18	21	36	15
	Women RH	9	22	20	40	9
15. Fraternities are declining in importance on this campus.	Frat	4	26	26	39	7
	Sor	3	41	28	28	5
	Fac-Adm	2	41	50	2	0
	Men RH	0	58	21	18	3
	Women RH	2	51	22	22	2
16. Fraternities promote conduct consistent with good morals.	Frat	0	39	37	17	7
	Sor	5	46	44	5	0
	Fac-Adm	0	11	27	45	16
	Men RH	3	6	24	36	30
	Women RH	0	4	20	47	29

TABLE 1
CONTINUED

Statement	Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17. The activities of fraternities are in accord with the aims and purposes of the University of Missouri.	Frat	15	59	15	7	7
	Sor	26	49	18	3	0
	Fac-Adm	0	18	48	27	7
	Men RH	3	15	36	42	3
	Women RH	2	22	42	29	4
18. The consumption of alcoholic beverages should be allowed in fraternity houses.	Frat	35	35	15	11	4
	Sor	10	33	13	31	13
	Fac-Adm	9	39	11	30	11
	Men RH	9	21	15	27	27
	Women RH	9	36	18	31	9
19. Fraternity members get better jobs when they graduate than nonmembers.	Frat	17	37	26	15	4
	Sor	10	13	38	33	5
	Fac-Adm	0	11	41	41	7
	Men RH	6	9	30	39	15
	Women RH	2	2	20	47	29
20. Belonging to a fraternity is a benefit academically.	Frat	20	52	15	11	2
	Sor	13	51	21	15	0
	Fac-Adm	0	11	27	48	14
	Men RH	6	9	21	45	18
	Women RH	2	22	16	40	18

TABLE 2

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS SHOWING SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF FRATERNITY OPINION WITH EACH SAMPLE GROUP.

Statement number	Sorority	Faculty-Administrator	Men's Residence Hall	Women's Residence Hall
1.		*		
2.	**			*
3.		**	**	**
4.	**	**	**	**
5.		**	**	
6.		**	**	**
7.		**	**	**
8.			**	*
9.			**	*
10.		**		
11.		**	**	**
12.		*		
13.	*			
14.		**	**	**
15.		**	*	
16.		**	**	**
17.		**	**	**
18.	*	*	**	*
19.	*	**	**	**
20.		**	**	**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

REFERENCES

Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of attitude scale construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Havice, Charles W. (Ed.) Campus values. Boston, Mass.: Northeastern University Press, 1966.

Is Greek town on main street? Missouri Alumnus, Quoted Jack Mathews, 1968, 58, (3), 19.

Likert, Rensis, A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Archives of Psychology, 1932, 22, (140), 5-55.

Sherman, J. R. Attitudes toward the men's social fraternities at the University of Colorado. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1967, 8, 75-79.